



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

chain be so invisible, surely the chain of internal evidence must be very firmly welded. Where do we find the internal evidence? In two points: first, in the fact that the passage fits so "wonderfully" after Blass has put it two verses farther back than his lame external evidence permits, and I contend that that is worse than no internal evidence; it is internal evidence for a place in which the verses are not even to be found in that freak of testimony in those few minuscules. And, nevertheless, Blass is so much pleased with the result that he writes: "I venture to say that this connection is so perfect that it cannot be the result of chance, but must really go back to the author," and he actually adduces, as a literary parallel, Acts 15: 41—16: 4; 18: 1-3, 4. No philologically, or I might, perhaps, say theologically, trained man would believe that a scholar could print such sentences. The second point is the fact that the style is pronounced to be Luke's. This Blass has proved, he says, in another book. I cannot think that his proof there is better than the proof we have just seen here. I suppose that he presses the words common also to Luke and explains the words not in Luke as individualities of Luke in this passage; Blass suggests similar proofs elsewhere in this book; and just as feeble proofs have, I regret to say, sometimes been used by that "scientific theology" which Blass so much deprecates. There is the whole proof. Then Blass gives, on pp. 159-63, three pages of "ifs" and of suppositions, not worth one straw for the consideration of the question, seeing that there is no proof for the whole position, and closes with that remarkable sentence as to "firm proof." Blass should go to Harnack and learn method.

CASPAR RENÉ GREGORY.

UNIVERSITY OF LEIPZIG,
Germany.

THE EXPOSITOR'S GREEK TESTAMENT. Edited by W. ROBERTSON NICOLL, M.A., LL.D. Complete in 5 vols. Vol. I: *The Gospels of St. Matthew, St. Mark, and St. Luke*, by REV. PROFESSOR ALEXANDER BALMAIN BRUCE; and *The Gospel of John*, by REV. PROFESSOR MARCUS DODS, D.D. London: Hodder & Stoughton; New York: Dodd, Mead & Co. Pp. viii + 872. Cloth, \$7.50.

ALFORD'S Greek Testament has been for more than a generation the most widely used of all English commentaries on the Greek text. The volume containing the gospels appeared in 1849, the fourth and concluding volume in 1860. Its comprehensive scope, constructive

method, and the generally sound conception of biblical science that dominated it, set Dean Alford's work immeasurably in advance of Bloomfield and other English contemporaries, and it became at once a leading text-book and manual. By no means the least of its services to English students was that it introduced them to the best results of German criticism and exegesis. Its long-enduring usefulness, however, has been due less to its importation of foreign learning than to its positive merits of method and exegetical skill.

"*The Expositor's Greek Testament*," Dr. Nicoll announces in the general editor's preface, "is intended to do for the present generation the work accomplished by Dean Alford's in the past;" a worthy project, but, in this age of widened biblical research and popularized criticism, not easy of accomplishment. This first volume, containing the gospels, was assigned to Drs. Bruce and Dods; the editors of the forthcoming four volumes are not named. Alford's plan is closely adhered to, providing for a body of marginal references illustrating New Testament grammar and idiom, subjoined textual notes, the remainder of the page being devoted to the commentary proper; and not only is the material similarly upon the page, but the letter press occupies precisely the same space.

The present volume makes a welcome addition to our New Testament apparatus, increasing our indebtedness to the two distinguished scholars just named. Both of the introductions, that to the synoptic gospels by Dr. Bruce, and to John's gospel by Dr. Dods, show a master's hand. The nature of the synoptic problem is stated with unusual clearness; in the method of its solution Dr. Bruce adopts the hypothesis which now commands a majority vote, the hypothesis of two main written sources: "a book like our canonical Mark, if not identical with it, as the source of narratives common to the three gospels, and another book containing sayings of Jesus, as the source of the didactic matter common to Matthew and Luke." In enumerating the other leading theories, the first, "the hypothesis of *oral tradition*," is not quite accurately named, nor fairly described: "The statements made by the apostles from time to time, repeated and added to as occasion required, caught up by willing ears and treasured up in faithful memories: behold all that is necessary, according to the patrons of this hypothesis, to account for all the evangelic phenomena of resemblance and difference." Gieseler's theory, with its fuller elucidation by Norton, Ebrard, Wetzel, and others, not to speak of its able "patrons" among English critics, is hardly to be bowed out of court in this fashion.

Particularly fresh and interesting is the section on "Historicity," and the evidence adduced of a real interest on the part of the primitive church in historic facts. Mark's gospel in its own way "testifies to the influence of the historic as distinct from the religious spirit in the early period of the Christian era," and Luke stands out prominently as a type of what was evidently a large class of early believers who were dominated by the fact-loving spirit. "Historicity," however, is not to be confounded with absolute accuracy, or with perfect agreement between parallel accounts in the gospels; "harmonistic is a thing of the past." It may need saying to the unwary reader that Dr. Bruce uses the term harmonistic *in malam partem* ("antiquated harmonistic" is his term in another passage), not the scientific method of ascertaining the real harmony of historical records. His acceptance of the too common interpretation of knowing Christ "after the flesh" in 2 Cor. 5:16, as being "the fact knowledge of Jesus," provokes inquiry as to whether paragraph 3 on p. 15 fairly states the historical situation.

Of the special introductions, that on Matthew is the least satisfactory. One looks for a fuller interpretation of its scope and purpose, and for such a conspectus or tabular analysis as would aid the student in apprehending its structure and the relation of its discourse chapters to the body of the narrative; compare, for example, Professor Burton, "Purpose and Plan of the Gospel of Matthew," in the *Biblical World*, February and March, 1898.

The Greek text placed at the head of the page is none other (barring frequent variations of spelling) than the *Textus receptus*. At first glance this is simply amazing, and the explanation afforded in the introduction (p. 52) does not relieve the case. This text, we are told, "may seem to be entirely out of date. But it is an important historical monument, and it is the Greek original answering to the English Testament still largely in use in public worship and in private reading. Moreover, while the experts in modern criticism have done much to provide a purer text, their judgments in many cases do not accord, and their results cannot be regarded as final." Are students to make the *Textus receptus* a working basis until that remote day when the judgments of experts come to be in final and precise accord? Surely this is not the method of science. One of the student's earliest tasks is to familiarize himself with a critical text, such as that of Tischendorf, Westcott and Hort, or that which answers to the Revised Version. But neither editor has gone back to Burgon. As a matter of fact, the

commentary below the text either expressly or silently adopts the most of the readings in which the three critical texts just named agree, although exercising an independent judgment. Dr. Dods prefers *γενομένου* of the *Textus receptus* to *γινόμενον* in John 13:2 as "giving the better sense," which we think needs more proof than is furnished. In Matt. 28:19, on the other hand, Dr. Bruce is very bold, and adopts *βαπτίσαντες*, believing *βαπτίζοντες* to be "probably a conformation to *διδάσκοντες* in next clause." The so-called "western non-interpolations" in Luke are each noted; a hint should somewhere be given of their peculiar history. In John 3:13 Dr. Dods notes that *ὁ ὢν ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ* are words "added in the *Textus receptus*," but comments upon their meaning as if they were, after all, to be considered in some sense a part of the discourse. On the whole, it would be impossible, we think, to construct from the notes the precise Greek text adopted.

The commentary proper—the body of exegetical notes—abounds in suggestive matter. Critical questions touching the synoptic narrative and discourse receive much attention, and one comes constantly upon fresh points of view in passing from chapter to chapter. Indeed, in this part of the volume there is a *plus* of criticism and a *minus* of exegesis. The passage in Matt., chap. 11, beginning "Come unto me," is an example of Dr. Bruce's tendency to subordinate the exegetical to the critical interest. We are too often assured that a narrated fact is "credible," or that we may reasonably consider a certain "logion" of Jesus genuine.

Dr. Dods holds himself more closely to the exegete's proper task. The marginal notes on grammar and idiom are carefully done and suited to the student's need. And here the question is in place, why the marginal space is left almost entirely unused in the portions on Mark and Luke, discontinuing for a considerable part of the volume that useful feature of the Alford plan. Both of the commentators have too frequently neglected translation. The old-fashioned method is still the best, though it may not always make so readable a page, of giving first of all a close translation of the phrase or sentence to be interpreted. To take a single instance out of many, we should like to have Dr. Bruce's rendering of Luke 10:21, or Dr. Dods' of the words *ὅτι ἐγὼ ζῶ καὶ ὑμεῖς ζήσετε* in John 14:19.

We also miss carefully discriminated definition, in which respect the exegetical student needs help and stimulus more than in any other. On the difficult word *πληροφορέω* in Luke's preface there is an excellent note, but on the phrase *ὁμολογέω ἐν* in Matt. 10:32 and

Luke 12:8 the reader is abandoned to his own resources. In Matt. 3:15 δικαιοσύνη, and 16:18 ἐκκλησία, are terms in which painstaking definition is indispensable to the execution of the interpreter's task. As to the latter, Dr. Bruce would probably not object to Cremer's definition, "the Christian community in the midst of Israel," but the reader is left in uncertainty. In Matt. 8:20 ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου is thus explained: "a remarkable designation occurring here for the first time. It means much for the speaker, who has chosen it deliberately, in connection with private reflections, at whose nature we can only guess, by study of the many occasions on which the name is used. Here it seems to mean the man *simpliciter* (son of man = man in Hebrew or Syriac), *the unprivileged Man*," etc. At Matt. 3:7 the Pharisees and Sadducees have a single descriptive sentence: "The first mention of classes of whom the gospels have much to say, the former being the legal precisians, virtuosi in religion, the latter the men of affairs and of the world, largely belonging to the sacerdotal class (consult Wellhausen, *Die Pharisäer und die Sadducäer*)."

Our space will permit only a few further references by way of illustrating Dr. Bruce's style of comment. John's baptism of Jesus is viewed as "consecrating him to his Messianic calling;" as to the dove-like appearance, "whatever is to be said as to the objective element, the subjective at all events is real." John the Baptist fares hardly: "Their ideas of righteousness separated the two men [John and Jesus] by a wide gulf." The Sermon on the Mount should rather be entitled the Teaching on the Hill; that is to say, it probably represents "the teaching, not of a single hour or day, but of a period of retirement." Of Christ's idea of the kingdom as presented in the sermon: "Christ speaks of the kingdom here, not as a known quantity, but as a thing whose nature he is in the act of defining by the aphorisms he utters. If so, then it consists essentially in states of mind. It is within. It is ourselves, the true ideal human." The note on Matt. 5:16 contains this remark: "The double-sided doctrine of this logion of Jesus is that the divine is revealed by the heroic in human conduct, and that the moral hero is the true son of God." Τοῦ πονηροῦ in the Lord's Prayer is taken as masculine, but the rendering "from evil" is preferred. "It mars the reality of the Lord's Prayer on western lips to say, deliver us from the evil one." On Matt. 10:41: "The man who has goodness enough to reverence the ideal of goodness approximately or perfectly realized in another, though not in himself, shall, in the moral order of the world, be counted as a good man." Good taste would have suggested the

omission of the parenthetic sentence in the note on Mark 14 : 52 — an illustration that fails to illustrate either the text or Bengel's note. At Luke 9 : 1, *δύναμιν καὶ ἐξουσίαν*, "power and right; power implies right. The man that can cast out devils and heal disease is entitled to do so, nay bound. This principle found an important application in St. Paul's claim to be an apostle, which really rested on fitness, insight."

Notwithstanding its valuable matter, which all scholars will be quick to recognize, and its frequent felicitous comment, we cannot regard this volume as well adapted to fulfil the specific practical mission proposed by the general editor. Of exegetical method it is far from being a model. Besides the list of errata following the preface, many misprints still remain for correction in future editions. No rule seems to have been followed in its accentuation of oxytone words in the notes, when they stand alone or final. The title of Burton's *Syntax* is not correctly given on p. 59. In general the titles of books as given in the notes need revision; Schürer's *Geschichte* is cited in a variety of ways. On p. 180, in the note on vs. 29, the italicized *on* should be *of*; p. 220, col. 1, read *εἰδία* for *εὐδία*; p. 222, col. 1, before the words "in a limestone cave," erase comma; p. 719, col. 1, for *ἐκ* read *ἐκεί*.

WM. ARNOLD STEVENS.

ROCHESTER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

DIE HEILSBEDeutung DER TAUFEn IM NEUEN TESTAMENTE. Von LIC. THEOL. PAUL ALTHAUS, Pastor zu Brüggen in Hannover. Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1897. Pp. xii + 321. M. 4.50; bound, M. 5.40.

THIS book is the outcome of convictions regarding the saving significance of baptism, intense enough to find no extravagance in Luther's strongest expressions, even those in his post-anabaptistic teachings upon that rite. Its style of discussion is also a little uncomfortably suggestive of the *hoc est meum corpus*, the *hocus focus* insistence of that controversialist at the Marburg conference. Its arrangement is repetitive and too much given, as the Puritan phrase is, "to condescend on particulars." But such features of composition, while vices in a writer, are virtues in a preacher, and enable us to infer with some probability the homiletic origin of these pages.

The following summary of the concluding statements of the treatise